Dailn

Amion.

"LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION."

NUMBER 297

CITY OF WASHINGTON, SATURDAY MORNING, APRIL 2, 1853.

IN CONGRESS OF THE U. STATES. Thirty-Second Congress-Second Session

> THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 1853. [IN CONTINUATION.]

Mr. BAYARD. I shall not detain the Senate long with the remarks which I have to make. But I feel it due to myself, as I voted in favor of the increase of the appropriation to the Collins line at a former session of Congress, to state the principal reasons why I think there is a difference between the appropriation then granted and that asked for now. The present amendment proposes to increase the compensation to the lines of steamers running from the United States to Bremen and Havre When the question came before the Senate on the increase of the appropriation to the Collins line, I viewed it as a national question. I then stated, in the remarks which I made, that I would not hereafter go for any extension of compensation to any other line, unless it could be shown to be a similar case. The government had adopted, whether wisely or not it is now too late to determine, the policy of establishing a line of steamers which it was supposed would be made available for certain purposes in time of war, and in the interim, during peace, could be used for the purpose of mail transportation. The Collins line, running from New York to Liverpool, had entered into a contract for the construction of steamers to transport your mails between New York and Liverpool—the great line of postal communication, not only with England, but with Europe. The moment that centract was made, a rival line previously in existence under the patronage of the English government, was doubled in its service; and thus supported by the patronage of their vessels to give greater speed, and necesarily incurred greater cost in the construction, and greater cost in the subsequent sailing. Under these circumstances when the contract was made. There was a direct line, which was supported in part by the treasury of a foreign government, established in opposition to the Colline line, and we were called OCEAN MAIL STEAMERS. part by the treasury of a foreign government, established in opposition to the Colline line, and we were called upon, under all the circumstances, viewing the matter in a national point of view, to increase their compensa-

But, sir, I cannot perceive that this line stands in the

But the gentleman says that we get paid back for this by improvement in abipping, by improvement in machine-shops and in yards. And he says that if we were to have a war, the result of that experiment would be that we would be able to engage is the war under more favorable circumstances. And, sir, how does he sustain that proposition? He says that the Collins line sprung suddenly into existence, and that it eclipsed all the British experiments that had been statted and tostered by protection. How was it that we were enabled to eclipse those British experiments which had been founded upon government protection? Was it not because our mechanics and steam marine had been reared upon the principle of free competition here at home, and without protection; and that that had so sharpened human ingeneity, and so rewarded human exertion by securing to it the profits of its own labor, that our mechanics developed a superiority over and above the foreign artisans, who had lived and moved and breathed under a system of protection?

Mr. DAVIS. I will ask the senator if he thinks any one of the Collins ships would have been built if it had

moved and breathed under a system of protection?

Mr. DAVIS. I will ask the senator if he thinks any one of the Collins ships would have been built if it had not been for the advance made by the government?

Mr. HUNTER. I have believed that if the government had not interfered before this time, we should have had mail steamers as good, and perhaps better, than the Collins line, carrying the mails wherever they would have paid. And I believe that so far from being better able to go into war on account of that experiment, and to support the navy, it has proved an incubus to the progress of the naval service. You have expended money in this reckless experiment which ought to have gone to the navy; and you have absolutely sent ships affoat which have proved to be incapable for naval purposes, unless as mere transports. If, instead of doing this, you had appropriated the money to the navy proper, to build screw propellers—which is the form that the steam war marine is assuming over all the rest of the world—it would have been much better. So far, then, from contributing to our means of naval defence, I believe it is the reverse; that it has put us back, and we have expended our money in the improper direction. That is one of the reasons why I am unwilling to go further. I believe that so far as the war marine, the navy, is concerned, it has to be supported out of the treasury. That is a national concern; but, so far as these commercial enterprises are concerned, either to transport passengers or commodities, that we should support them under the idea that they will even compensate us in the way of postages is fulle. The idea of entering into such an anterprise for the purpose of transporting commodities and passengers is to me utterly odious, for it does not become the government to enter into such enterprises, which belong to individuals. I think that instead of giving a spur to the progress of our people by such miscalled assistance as this, we impede and clog them.

which belong to individuals. I think that instead of giving a spar to the progress of our people by such miscalled assistance as this, we impede and clog them.

Mr. MALLORY. I voted against the appropriation for the Collins line last year, and with the lights now before us I shall feel it my duty to vote against every increase of compensation to steam lines. This system of legislation, in my judgment, is improper, and produces a very singular state of things. We saw last Congress our halls crowded with agents to obtain the increased compensation. We were not blind to the fact that scores of agents came here who were bired and paid to prosecute legislation through Congress for that line. The idea which was then prominently held out, that this would be a system by which she transportation of the mails would be self-sustaining, is now exploded, and we find that the argument was based alone upon what was considered national price, and that the speed of the vessel is all that we have at larged-some lew hours gain in crossing the Atlantance.

which was then urged, that these steamers would form a which was then urged, that these steamers would form a part of the national defence, though it has not yet failen through, will, in my opinion, inevitably do so at the very first trial. Such "ricketty concerns"—which is the proper term applied by the senator from Virginia to such vessels—have not one single element of war steamers, except in speed; and that is calculated rather to enable them to escape from than to meet an enemy. At the very moment that the great maritime nations of the earth, after moment that the great maritime nations of the earth, after experimenting upon the subject upon a grand scale, have abandoned side-wheel steamers, why should we be called upon to legislate and appropriate money to keep up such a system? It is found to be utterly impracticable, and the navies of France, and England, and Russia, have all abandoned or are abandoning the side wheel, and have resorted to the proneller. And in regard to this particular Collins line, an officer who examined them, in his report states distinctly that they could only be used for transports, unless the upper deck was removed; and then who does not know that if you remove the upper deck you would have the wheels four feet above the main deck? in which case you would have to place one gun forward and one aft. This is the kind of war steamer that you have—of no sort of use whatever, except to run away from an enemy.

which case you would have to place one gun forward and one aft. This is the kind of war steamer that you have—of no sort of use whatever, except to run away from an enemy.

Now, sir, I do not mean to go into the details of this subject. I throw out this general view to show what has already been demonstrated by England and France, that side-wheel steamers are inapplicable for war purposes. Compare these with the ships in the English navy. Great Britain this moment has twenty-nine propellers, embracing ships of from one hundred and forty guns to six. They have ships of the largest class, larger than our own Pennsylvania, and instead of adopting the side-wheel, they have adopted the propeller system. We have taken directly the reverse, and at the very moment that the maritime nations of the earth are abandoning the system we are expending millions to keep it up.

In regard to what the senator from Massachusetts has said about this system cheapening the fare of emigrants across the Atlantic, every American, as a matter of course, welcomes those who come from down-trodden nations, but the emigrants do not come in seamers at all. They come in sailing vessels, which will always exist in spite of our legislation. The system of legislating thus to dole out money to steam lines, when they come here and demand it, will encourage this state of things; for the senator knows well that when we give to one, it encourages another to come and demand the same. As the senator from Virginia [Mr. Hunter] has correctly observed, open this thing to competition, and my word for it, there will be an improvement in the vessels much greater than has yet taken place. Open it up to all who will boild ships to run in competition, and it will be the interest of each to have the best kind of vessels.

Mr. RUSK. I do not intend to pretract this argument. I was in hopes that there would be a vote taken upon the amendment without any discussion; but this is too fruitful a theme to escape discussion. If I were anxious to go into an argument, and

in a national point of view, to increase their compensation.

By, air, I cannot perceive that this line stands in the same position. I know of no foreign government which same position. I know of no foreign government which same position. I know of no foreign government which same position. I know of no foreign government which same position. I know of no foreign government which she may be a second to the same position. I would be some of the compensation in the other case. The absence of this competition is a reason sufficient to induce me to vote against this increase of compensation. I might mention other reasons, but as this is sufficient with the second position. I might mention other reasons, but as the sufficient is about to establish, or has established by and from the public treasury, a line to run in competition with this line, I cannot vote for the amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. The sensitor from Massachusetts, life. Davies, it il understand him, supports this amend him supports this amend him supports the principle was considered to the purpose of cheapening labor.

Mr. Davis, it il understand him, supports this amend in the support that the honorable senator was in tayor or what in called a protective system, because, as they say, it will increase the price of labor. I never believed that the reasoning advanced to support the principle was conditionable to the free traders. That is all. Laught the reasoning advanced to support the principle was conditionable to the free traders. That is all. Laught the suppose of cheapening labor.

Mr. DAVIS. That is not what I sand. I said that that would be one oil is results. and if thought that would be supreable to the free traders. That is all. Laught the suppose of transporting compensate labor is no throw everything open to free will labor the suppose of the suppose of cheapening labor.

Mr. DAVIS. That is not what I said. I said that that would be supreable to the free traders. I say in relation to what the senator has said, that I desire emigration, like every

rect what I believed was a misapprehension of the sena-tor from Florida.

Mr. BORLAND. I desire to say that I shall vote

against this proposition for the same reason that I voted against the appropriation for the Collins steamers. I am unable to see any difference in the two cases, except that we gave a very large amount to the Collins steamers, and the amount proposed in this case is comparatively small. That is the only substantial difference that I can see. I have been strock with one thing, and that is the difference between the arguments now used and those which were used last year. Then postages were the foundation for the argument in favor of the appropriation. That seems to be abandoned now, and we have substituted for it the carrying of emigrants and freight. The principle remains the same, but the ground adopted for the argument last year seems to be abandoned, and we have new ones started in their places.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, on the question of the proposed amendment now, under discussion, I would not we gave a very large amount to the Collins steamers, and

ones started in their places.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, on the question of the proposed amendment now under discussion, I would not offer any remarks, were if not that I consider the honorable senators from Virginia and Klorida [Messrs. Hurter and Mallory] to have stepped saide from the subject in debate, to attack a measure adopted some time since by Congress, and in which I took some part. I have reference, sir, to the act granting additional compensation to the Collins line of steamers, for the transportation of the mail between New York and Liverpool. On that occasion I differed from both these senators in opinion; nor have I seen or heard anything since, not excepting what they have said to-day, to effect the least change in my opinion on that subject, nor to cause me to regret the part I took in the business, nor the vote given by me. On the contrary, the adoption of that measure, which gave me pleasure then, gives me pleasure still; and, contrary to the feeling expressed by my honorable friends, I consider the money well expended, were the result to be nothing more than the gratification of "national pride," and the "renown, honor, and reputation" the enterprise has conferred upon us, which the honorable senator from Virginia [Mr. Hunter] seems to regard so hightly.

Mr. President, what is a people without national pride? They can be but little better than savages. To have national pride is to be proud of our country, and is closely allied to patriotism. Surely it is a laudable pride that leads the citizens of one nation to emulate the greatness of money, that spiri can be gratified in the successful prosecution of great and useful enterprises, which redound to the "renown, honor, reputation." and wealth to the main the main of the

tures of money, that spirit can be gratified in the succeasful prosecution of great and useful enterprises, which redound to the "renown, honor, reputation," and wealth
of the nation, the means should not be withheld. Sir,
we have recently voted to increase the salaries of certain
of our ministers abroad, and very properly too, in my apprehension. But will it be pretended that these musters
could not have lived, not only very comfortably, but very
well indeed, on their former salaries? I think it will not.
Why, then, increase their salaries? To enable them to
live in a style more nearly approximating to that of the
representatives of the regal governments of Europe; and
this purely from a feeling of national pride that will not
permit us to suffer reproach to be cast upon us abroad.
It is a noble feeling; and as long as I may live I hope to
see it maintained by every American offizen, and fostered
and sustained by our government. So long as the feeling of national pride shall animate the breasts of this
people, we have nothing to fear from all the rest of the
world combined. So long, a foreign invader can never
plant his feet on our shores. Crush it, and our liberties
are gone.

and cents. Some things there are, in my estimation, far more important to our country. And while we should carefully guard the treasury against wanton waste, I will never consent to be one to stand by it as a surly watch-dog, to bar all access to its deposits in every case except when stern necessity may open its vaults. It is my impression, sir, that the United States treasury is the repository of the psople's money, and that there can be no better use made of the excess, after having fully provided for the wants of the government, than to expend it for purposes and on objects calculated to promote the public good. I would not recommend measures to empty the treasury and to impoverish the government; neither would I act the miserity part, and, from the mere love of money, hoard it up, and thus withhold the benefits it otherwise might confer. We are asked "How can immister to the renown, the reputation, or the glory of our nation, to keep up, at the expense of the United States treasury, such enterprises, such steamers, as cannot support themselves?" And sgain: "I acknowledge that it is beneficial to facility postal communications, provided it can be done on the self-sustaining principle." Once more: "If we could open a new line of legitimate business which would spring up and support itself upon the legitimate fruits of industry, I acknowledge it would redound to our nation al honor and reputation." Now, sir, from all these remarks, I can deduce but one isolated idea; it is, that nothing can redound to the giory, honor, and reputation of our country except it shall return to the government of our country except it shall return to the government of our country except it shall return to the government of the country demands it, whether the enterprise be self-sustaining or not.

Sir, I have necessative all the show account, but had not the means. But, sir, the honorable gentlemant from Virginia, [Mr. Hiterathy acknowledge it would redound to our nation of our commander of the country demands it, whether the enter a new line of legitimate business which would spring up and support itself upon the legitimate fruits of industry, I acknowledge it would redound to our national honor and reputation." Now, sir, from all these remarks, I can deduce but one isolated idea; it is, that nothing can redound to the glory, honor, and reputation of our country except it shall return to the government at least dollar for dollar for the expenditure. This, truly, is calculating national renown, glory, honor, and reputation on the busis of the standard value of gold and silver—a rule that never occurred to me before. Of course, tion on the basis of the standard value of gold and silver—a rule that never occurred to me before. Of course, if dollar for dollar would give to our country a certain amount of renown, glory, honor, and reputation, or, in the senator's language, if "a new line of legitimate business" would give us a certain amount of those commodities, then, by the same rule, a profit of one hundred percent would increase them prodigiously. My own opinion is, that the renown, honor, glory, and reputation, of either nation or individual, that rests on, or is created by money and money-making, is not worth much; and if this result is all the people of the United States are to realize from government expenditures, it would seem to me that they will not have much to thank us for.

Mr. President, what constitutes the true basis of the renown, glory, honor, and reputation of a nation, and for

Art. President, what constitutes the true basis of the re-nown, glory, honor, and reputation of a nation, and for which, while thankful to a higher power, they have good reason to indulge in a becoming degree of national pride? Sir, in my estimation those great and important characteristics rest principally not on wealth, but on the government of a nation—on its political and civil insti-tutions, the virtue and intelligence of its people, its just and equal laws, and its exercise of instice and equity at tutions, the virtue and intelligence of its people, its just and equal laws, and its exercise of justice and equity at home and abroad. In a nation where these approximate nearest to perfection there is no need to purchase a counterfeit reputation with gold and silver. There talent and industry will be sure to meet their reward; there works of civilization and art will spring up; there national and individual wealth will accumulate; and with tional and individual wealth will accumulate; and with these will the national greatness be built up and established. On this greatness will be reflected the "renown, glory, honor, and reputation" of the nation, created by its moral and political character. Sir, nothing can add more to this national greatness than progress in civilization and the arts; and every dollar expended by the government to promote these, though it may not be returned directly to the treasury, will yield a ten-fold profit to the people, from whom it was first derived and whose property it is. On this view of the subject, sir, my opinion is, that Congress is, or would be, fully justified in extending pecuniary aid to enterprises to extend civilization and the arts as a general benefit, ever without the expectation or promise of a direct remunerating return to the treasury. Such has been the practice of all civilized governments; and to this practice, in part at least, do

treasury. Such has been the practice of all civilized governments; and to this practice, in part at least, do Great Britain and France owe the commanding position they occupy in science, literature, and the arts.

Mr. President, it was on the ground of the general benefit to be conferred that I, as well as others, advocated and voted for the additional compensation to the Collins line of steamers. It was aeither predicted nor promised, to my knowledge, as the senator from Virginia [Mr. Hunter] would seem to infer, that "postages were to increase immediately," so as to make the transportation of the mail a self-sustaining business. The gratification of national pride, the vast benefits conferred on the country by means of the important mechanical improvements arrived at in the process of constructing the vessels that compose that line, the powerful effect produced in consequence on our merchants steam matrie, and also the beneficial effect that might be expected to result to our steam navy—these were the principal causes urged, and constituting the main ground on which the appropriation was made; and I allege, sir, that it was money well expended, even if a single dollar of it were never returned But the senator from Virginia infers that, had not Congress interfered in the construction of these ships, private enterprise and competition would have caused ships, private

But the senator from Virginia infers that, had not Congress interfered in the construction of these ships, private enterprise and competition would have caused ships to built, as good as these, if not better. If things were not us they are, no one can tell how they would have been Private enterprise, without government aid, hight have produced all that the honorable gentlemen imagine, and it might produce nothing. This is a mere natter of opinion. One fact, however, is clear to my view—if the government wished to have steamers built suitable for war purposes, to be placed partially under its control, with the right to take them into the public service whenever it might see fit, it was no more than right and just that government should also contribute to pay the extra cost incurred on that account. But it has been said that these ships are "ricketty" concerns. If they are so, a government contract, under the supervision of experienced officers of the navy, who recommended them when finished to the government. To call them "ricketly" concerns is to pay but a poor compliment to those officers. I know not how deeply versed the senators from Virginia and Florida [Messrs. Hunter and Mallout] may be in the art of naval construction; but, for my own part, I would much prefer to rely on the opinion in this matter of the navy officers who superintended their construction, the unrivalled success which has attended these ships on the ocean, and the unqualified approbation be stowed on them by the many thousands who have made passages in them. My honorable friends are the only persons I have ever heard of who pronounced them "ricketly" concerns; and against this denunciation stands, it is believed, the full force of universal public opinion, at home and abroad.

it is believed, the full force of universal public opinion, at home and abroad.

But we have also been told that these ships are unfit for war purposes, except to be used as transports. And why so! They are as strong as our navy steamers; have as good sea going qualities, and, in point of speed, far exceed the best of them. Why, then, are they unfit for general war purposes? Simply because they have side-wheels, while the British and French governments are building propellers. Here, then, is another denunciation founded on a mere matter of opinion. No practical test has been had to decide the question. Perhaps we may be allowed, even in this country, to be as capable of forming a correct opinion on this subject as they are in England and France. The side-wheel steamer moves with much greater speed than the propeller, and, engaged in battle with the latter, can always choose her own position; if likely to be overpowered, she can readily had off and leave her antagonist—neither of which the propeller can do. But the great apprehension with As act to incorporate the Sisters of Yusitation of Washington D. S., and the south the latter, can always choose her you no position; if likely to be overpowered, she can reade it just off and leave bet antagonist—neither of wheth the proper appears to be the great appears to the propeler spears to think that every ball from an enemy mention and the subjects of Spain resolution for the relief of the Spaint considerable and the state of the Spaint considerable and the

whole country demands it, whether the enterprise be sen-sustaining or not.

Sir, I have nothing further to say on this subject; nor should I have said so much, but for the sake of vindi-cating myself, and those who acted with me on the ques-tion of making the additional compensation for the Col-lins line, against what appears to me an attack on us for our share in those proceedings, and which in this discus-sion I think, to say the least, is far-fetched and entirely

sion I think, to say the least, is far-fetched and entirely out of place
Mr. BORLAND called for the yeas and nays on the amendment to the amendment, and they were ordered.
Mr. RUSK. The first section of the amendment which the senator from Virginia moves to strike out proposes to give an additional allowance of \$6,000 a year for the round trip. The latter proposes to give authority to the Postmaster General to release the persons from the contract on the allowance of a reasonable compensation.

sation.

Mr. MORTON. As the yeas and nays have been ordered, I wish simply to state the reason which will control my vote on this question, and to show that I am somewhat consistent in my course. I was at all times an opponent of the increase of compensation to the Collins line; I voted against it in all its different aspects; but inasmuch as the Congress of the United States have thought proper to increase its compensation, I think equal justice should be extended to the Havre and Bremen line, and therefore I shall vote for the proposition of the senator from Texas.

senator from Texas.

The yeas and nays being taken on the amendment to YEAS—Messrs. Adams, Atchison, Bayard, Borland, Bradbury, Bright, Brodhead, Butler, Cass, Chase, Dawson, Desaussure, Dodge of Iowa, Fitzpatrick, Geyer, Hamili, Houston, Hunter, Jones of Iowa, Mallory, Mason, Norris, Pettit, Phelps, Pratt, Sebastian, Shields, Sumner, Underwood, Walker, and Weller—31.

NAYS—Messrs. Bell, Cooper, Davis, Downs, Foot, Gwin, James, Monton, Rusk, Smith, Soule, and Spruance—12

amendment by striking out all that remains of it after the words "rescind the same," so as to leave it that if they choose to abandon the contract, the Postmaster General may accept the abandonment.

choose to abandon the contract, the Postmaster General may accept the abandonment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, (Mr. Mason) The Chair would inform the senator from Texas that the first section of his amendment having been stricken out, it is necessary to modify the second section by inserting the names of the company.

Mr. RUSK The opponents of the amendment have knocked the life out of it, and they may galvanize it to suit themselves. I have no use for it whatever.

Mr. HUNTER. I will see if it is worth preserving. Several Senators. Vote it down.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not willing to vote it down. I want the amendment adopted with the modification which I suggest. If those gentlemen choose to abandon their contract—if they have ascertained that it is a money-sinking business—I am willing to relieve them from it, but I am not willing to pay them and leave it as a matter of discretion with the department to pay what it pleases, they having made an unfortunate contract. If you will strike out the latter part of the section as I propose, and then leave the proposition, it will stand precisely in this way: If they are tired of your contract they may surrender it. If they choose to carry it out, they have a right to do it; but if they choose to surrender it, I am willing to permit it. I therefore move to strike out of the amendment the words "making such allowance as he may deen equitable and just."

Mr. BAYARD. What do the words "said companies

nay deem equitable and just."

Mr. BAYARD. What do the words "said companies

Several SENATORS. We are going to vote it all down.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to; and
the question recurring on the amendment as amended, it

NEW ORLEANS AND VERA CRUZ STEAMERS.

there is no appropriation to carry it out. It is with a view to remedy that oversight that I propose the following amendment:

For carrying out the contract entered into by the Post Ofongress, establishing a tri-monthly mail by steam ves-els between New Orleans and Vera Cruz, via Tampico,

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were then ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

It was read a third time and passed.

A message was received from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hayes, Chief Clerk, announcing that the focation of the speaker having signed sundry earolled bills, he was diected to bring them to the Senate for the signature of heir President.

The PRESIDENT then signed the following enrolled tills which had just been received from the House of MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Representatives:
An act authorizing changes in the location of land

offices.

An act for the relief of S. M. Goldsborough and others.

An act for the relief of Catharine Proctor Hayden, only child and heir of John White, deceased, late a lieutenant colonel in the fourth Georgia battalion of the rev-

tenant colone: in the fourth Georgia battalion of the rev-olutionary army.

As act to incorporate the Sisters of Visitation of Wash-ington, D. C.

A joint resolution for the relief of the heir of John de Neulville.

Mr. HAMLIN. It is precisely so, Mr. President. Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman intends to do

Mr. NORRIS called for the yeas and nays on the meon, and they were ordered.

Mr. BUTLER. This is one of the most magnificent umbags of the day.

Mr. BAYARD. Without committing myself to what

and can be discussed. I shall now vote against taking up this or any other bill that will lead to discussion during this session of Congress, because I am perfectly satisfied myself that this is not the time to enter into the discused questions connected with the appropriation bills to come before us. If you desire to take up and pass measures that are not objectionable, I shall not oppose doing so; but I shall oppose measures that are to lead to a gen-eral discussion. If we get into the discussion of such bills, senators will get into a state of excitement, so that

bills, senators will get into a state of excitement, so that committees of conference will not be able to make their reports; or if they do, senators will not know anything about the reports submitted by them.

Mr. GWIN. I give notice that if the bill is taken up, and you begin to resuscitate bills that have been laid to bring up the Pacific railroad bill, which had its brains knocked out the other day, and move that as an amendment.

So the motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in committee of the whole, proceeded to consider the bill from the House of Representatives "making a grant of the public lands to the several States of the Union, for the benefit of indigent insane persons."

Mr. DODGE, of Iowa. I move to amend the bill by adding to it what is commonly called the homestead bill, divested of the feature which is so objectionable to my friend from Mississippi, [Mr. Adams]—that section which requires a man to make something like an oath of insolvency before he is allowed to take a portion of the public land for a homestead. I suppose there will be no sort of opposition to the amendment. I believe that the Senate is exceedingly anxious to vote for the passage of the homestead bill, and therefore I will not detain it by saying anything further. saying anything further.

Mr. BELL. The bill for the relief of the indigent in-

sane has passed the rigid examination of several se-lect committees—committees chosen to examine it speci-ally in reference to the provisions that could be prudentany in reference to the provisions that could be prudently and constitutionally made, appropriating a portion of the public domain for the relief not of the thirty thousand meane persons in the United States—the number shown by the late census—but for the relief of some fourteen or fifteen thousand indigent insane persons who have no means, no family, no influence, political or otherwise, that can ever reach the heart or effect the feelings of this assembly or the other house of Congress Von have that can ever reach the heart or effect the feelings of this assembly or the other house of Congress. You have passed hundreds of bills founded upon what has been supposed or alieged to be extraordinary suffering, privation, or claims upon the bounty or gratitude of the government. You have gone even to the remote heirs of those who are alleged to have shed their blood, or wasted their property, or suffered privations in the revolution, and showered your bounty upon them. You argue or pretend that all this is but justice, and what is due to particle and the descendants of prairiots. But neither impretend that all this is out justice, and what is due to partial triots and the descendants of ratriots. But neither impartiality nor gratitude, nor a generous and beneficent policy can be shown to lie at the bottom of all this. It is interested and for display mainly, and grants of this kind are seldom made except under the pressure of personal or political influences.

I have said that there is no equal justice or impartially in the distribution of bounties, by Congress. Take

I have said that there is no equal justice or imparti-ality in the distribution of bounties by Congress. Take the class of beneficiaries distinguished, or supposed to be distinguished, as revolutionary. What sort of justice have you done to the soldiers and patriots of the revolution? I can hardly suppress my indignation when I call to mind the treatment which the gallant men who fought the bat-tle of King's Mountain have received at the hands of the people, or at least of its organs and of the government. Not a man who fought in that battle, or the name of any of his descendants, is inscribed upon the pension lists on account of that battle; and for that reason I suppose it is, for I can conceive of no other, that the battle of King's Mountain is no longer accounted one of the battles of the Mountain is no longer accounted one of the battles of the revolution. No longer ago than last year I saw going the rounds of the leading journals of the United States, and revolution. No longer ago than last year I saw going the rounds of the leading journals of the United States, and even in such a respectable journal as the Intelligencer of this city, what purported to be an enumeration of the battles of the revolution, in which King's Mountain was left out; and I tell you, sir, that it is not very national for those who represent the section of the country where there are now some thousands of the descendants of the heroes in that battle; of those who voluntarily railing on that pecasion, merchan the very city of tarily rallied on that occasion—perhaps the very crisis of the revolution in the South—of the brave men who, at a moment's warning, grasped their rifles, mounted their own good steeds, pursued and overtook the enemy, adbing compenpurposes, to be placed partially under its control, with
to flines of its right to take them into the public service whenever
eace for the
war for war li these cases
that government should also contribute to pay the extra
diffuse cases
diffu no easy matter for the representative of such a race of men, when he finds that not one cent of the millions of money lavished is pensions and bountees by this govern-ment has ever been distributed among them, to form any high estimate of the patriotic spirit or the gratitude at the justice of the government, or of the disinterested gen-erosity of those who are always so prompt to vote dona-tions of soldiers. Just consider the treatment of the contions to solvers. Just consider the treatment of the con-querors at King's Mountain in the revolution, and then turn to the history of the last few years in relation to this practice of granting pensions and bounties to soldiers. Not only every man who fought in Mexico has either for that war, and marched, though they never reached the enemy's country, or heard the report of an ene-my's gun, have been rewarded with extraordinary boun-

ties.

Am I not justified, then, in characterizing this so-called generous and patriotic feeling which finds vent in military pensions and bounties, as deceifful and hollow—a humbug—a practice adopted more for the purpose of winning popularity and catching votes, than from any devotion to principle or sound policy, or to any sentiment of justice or humanity? But, sir, in the bill before us we have presented an opportunity for signalizing a true, and just, and disinterested generosity. We are here invited to grant a portion of the public domain to a class of our citizens who can never know or make any return to their benefactors.

grant a portion of the public domain to a class of our citizens who can never know or make any return to their benefactors.

Yes, sir, you have now an opportunity of showing what is in your hearts. This suffering class of indigent insane can give us no returns at the polls—no remunerating response to the benevolence, to the charitable disposition, and the philanthropic feelings of members of Congress. Some of them have clanking chains around them now, eating into their very bones; some of them are in desolate log-cabins and open pens, and some of them are secluded in dark pits, never seeing the light of day.

And here let me pay a tribute to an immortal genius—the celebrated De Foe. He was the first man who brought prominently into view and urged with irresistible eloquence the moral obligation of society to support the unfortunate and stricken lunatic, whose reason is overthrown, but who still belongs to the human family, and entitled to all the sympathies and charities of the public.

I repeat my appeal to the members of the Senate to

Mr. GWIN. It is perfectly evines.

It is perfectly evines of the two houses on appropriation billist.

We have committees of conference at work upon disagration bills; if we take up this confrowerted question at this nour of the season. I hope the senator will not at the appropriation bills; if we take up this confrowerted question at the first of the control of the control

rtioned to the above annual rates.

our numerity, and have a stoomer, than those indigent insane who have no land, and no home, and can never hope to have? If the landless and the homeless are really more meritorious or more deserving of such a donation as this—for they are both donations—then let the homestead bill have the preference, and let us first vote for that for that.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS

The name of no person will be entered upon our books, at it at Distant subscribers may forward us money by letter, the postage of which will be paid by us, and all risk assumed by ourselves in its safe.

The COUNTRY, PAPER is published tri-weekly during the see none of Congress, and semi-weekly during the recess.

Subscriptions for a period less than a year will be re-

(C)—POSTMASTERS are authorized to act as our agents; and, by sending us rive DALLY subscribers, with \$50 enclosed; or rive SEMI-WEEKLY subscribers, with \$55 enclosed; or rive WEEKLY subscribers, with \$10 enciosed, will be entitled to one copy of the same edition as they furnish us subscribers for, gratis.

Mr. BAYARD. Without committing myself to what may be my vote on this bill when it comes up regularly, and can be discussed, I shall now vote against taking upthis or any other bill that will lead to discussion during this session of Congress, because I am perfectly satisfied myself that this is not the time to enter into the discussion of measures of this kind. We yet have controverted questions connected with the appropriation bills to come before us. If you desire to take up and pass measures that are not objectionable, I shall not oppose doing so; but I shall oppose measures that are to lead to a general discussion. If we get into the discussion of such bills, senators will get into a state of excitement, so that committees of conference will not be able to make their reports; or if they do, senators will not know anything abut the reports submitted by them.

Mr. GWIN. I give notice that if the bill is taken up, and move them as amendments, I shall be compelled to bring up the Pacific railroad bill, which had its brains knocked out the other day, and move that as an amendment.

Mr. PETTIT. I only want to say that if the bill is laken up, laken up I shall desire to have it read. [Laughter.]

The question being taken by yeas and nays, resulted—yeas 20, nays 17—as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Bell, Bradbury, Bright, Chase, Clarke, Cooper, Davis, Dawson, Dawns, Frapatrick, Foot, Geyer, Hamilin, Honston, Mangam, Miller, Motton, Rosk, Spitastian, Shields, Smith, Spruance, Summer, Underwood, and Weller—25.

Na YS—Messrs. Adams, Atchison, Bayasd, Borland, Brodhead, Builer, Desaussure, Dodgs of lowa, Dayes, Gwin, Jones of Iowa, Mallory, Mason, Norris, Pettit, Pratiand Weller—26.

So the motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in committee of the whole, proceeded to consider the bill from the House of Representatives "making a grant of the public innats to the several States of the Union, for the benefit of indigent insane, erwising a grant of the public innats to the several States of the Union, for the benefit of indigen If the other class of claimants to which I have referred

what I propose. I hope my honorable friend will withdraw his amendment. I have heard it intimated that Bennett's land bill will be tacked to this. Let it be moved by itself also. After you have provided for the indigent insane, for the landless and homeless, then let us provide for the old States. That will come next in order. Bring them up consecutively. It fortunately so happens that we have disposed of our appropriation bills at rather an advanced period of the session—some fourteen hours earlier than is usual with Congress.

Mr. WALKER. They are not all disposed of.

Mr. BELL. Though they are not finally disposed of between the two houses, I have no doubt they will be without interruption. I therefore make this appeal to the Senate. Let us pass this bill, then we will take up the homestead bill and Bennett's land bill, and we can pass them all, if such is the pleasure of the Senate.

Mr. PETFIT. Mr. President, without saying whether I favor or disfavor the original bill taken up by the Senate, I must be permitted to say that I favor the amendment moved by the senator from lows, and that I desire to discuss it at some considerable length before the Senate. It is a measure that commends itself both to my heart and to my head—to my heart because it provides a home for the homeless and a house for the homeless and to my head because, in my judgment, it is one of the greatest and best measures for national strength and national defence that were ever devised by man. But, sir, whether I shall proceed or not depends upon the response that I shall get from the Senate. I am un villing to attempt to proceed to the discussion of this measure, and show, as I shall attempt to show, that it is for our national strength and national defence that we ought to adopt it, if I am to be interrupted by committees of conference or others which should come proposing to report. Will they have precedence over me? Shall I be under any obligation, either legal, moral, or from courtesy, to suspend and proceed to the discussion of forme

either legal, moral, or from courtesy, to suspend a signification?

Several Senators. Of course.

Mr. PETTIT. Is that the understanding? If so, I do not desire to proceed, for it is the calm attention of the Senate that I want upon this subject. I do not want to be interrupted. I will not proceed unless there is a common understanding that I shall be heard for the course of three-quarters of an hour. If that cannot be allotted—and there is no probability that it can be allotted—I shall certainly suspend now.

Several Senators. Go on! Go on!

Mr. BUTLER. I would not if I were the senator.

Mr. PETTIT. I know my honorable friend from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] is a good monitor. [Laughter.] Mr. President, I am satisfied that we shall not be able to accomplish any efficient definite action upon this subject during the remainder of this session. That I shall have a better opportunity to discuss, to a calm Senate at the next session, this whole subject, I have not a doubt. Knowing that the Senate is restive now, or that I must be in a few minutes interrupted, I shall prefer myself to decline going into a general discussion of the subject.

Mr. ADAMS called for the yeas and nays on the

myself to decline going into a general discussion of the subject.

Mr. ADAMS called for the yeas and nays on the amendment to the amendment, and they were ordered.

Mr. DODGE, of lowa. I feel that I would hardly do justice to the senator from Tennessee, [Mr. Bell.,] or to myself, if I did not make some reply to his remarks. He has pronounced a calogium upon the heroes of King's Mountain, and has paid a glowing tribute to our revolutionary ancestors. For one, in all that he has said in praise of that glorious band who stood to their arms in the hour of their country's need, and aided in achieving the hour of their country's need, and aided in achieving the hour of their country's need, and aided in achieving her independence—who, taking their lives in their hands. and turning their backs upon everything ordinarily held dear and sacred, went forth to a seven years' war, sometimes almost naked and unarmed, to encounter in deadly strife the mightiest, proudest, and, until then, the most invincible nation on earth. Independence and liberty are the Hesperian fruits produced by their sufferings, heroism, and blood; and for one, I say, be not only just but generous to them. Has my friend from Tennessee any proposition for relief to them? If so, I will go with him in support of it; and whilst rewarding the survivors of King's Mountain, let us not forget those of other hard-lought fields, such as "Stony Point," at which the dauntless Wayne stormed the British intrenchments at the point of the bayonet, having knocked the flents out of the guns of his soldiers.

Mr. BELL. Will the senator allow me one word! I have done it over and over again, but have been silenced and put down.

Mr. DODGE. I am gratified to hear that the senator Mr. DODGE. I am gratified to hear that the senator has exerted himself on so many different occasions to accomplish something for these surviving veterans. I can truly say that I was not one of those who contributed to put him down, or to defeat his measure. The senator is, I believe, a friend to the homestead bill as well as myself; and being so, I trust I shall have his vote, and potent influence for my amendment. I hope he will not be for giving this bill, as he did the great Pacific railroad bill, a preference over the homestead bill. I cordially co-operated with him in support of that bill, but I nevertheless thought that some of his arguments and illustrations did injustice to the homestead bill.

theless thought that some of his arguments and illustrations did injustice to the homestead hill.

Mr. BELL. I said not a word against it.

Mr. DODGE. The senator's word to me is sufficient for anything. I was going on to say, if he had not interrupted me, that his private declaration of friendship for the bill referred to afterwards undeceived me in regard to the matter. I know that whatever that senator professes he will act up to. But when he makes a special appeal to me to do or not to do certain things touching measures before this body, I answer it by referring to the arguments and course of himself and others upon measures in which and course of himself and others upon measures in which I feel a deep interest. The senator from Arkansas [Mr. Borlans] will well remember the occasion to which I allede, for he replied to the argument of the senator from Teanessee.

Mr. BELL. I said nothing against the homestead bill itself in my remarks to the senator from Arkansas; but I said that the railroad bill, whilst we had it up, ought to precede it, or upon the line of that, wherever it might be located, the homestead bill would occupy the lands—that is, within the limits of the six miles in the State on each side of the road. side of the road.

Mr. DODGE. Very well. Did not my friend, when it

Mr. DODGE. Very well. Did not my friend, when it was proposed to take up the homestead bill, and when there was time to discuss it, vote against taking it up?

Mr. BELL. I said that if you would lay down the Pacific railroad bill you would never reach it again; but I said not one word against the homestead bill.

Mr. DODGE. Be it so. I neither question the senator's sincerity nor consistency. I only wish to call attention to the fact that I, in the course which I am pursuing with regard to this bill, am doing nothing unfair nor unusual. I have not offered the amendment in a factious spirit. If my friend from Tennessee is friendly to the homestead bill, as I doubt not from his declaration that he is, and as I know he is from his private assertion to me on the subject, I have to ask him why he cannot yote to amend this bill? There is ample time to pass both measures, as they are known to be popular in the House of Representatives, both having passed that body by large